

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
EASTERN DIVISION

NORFOLK COUNTY,)
vs. Plaintiff,)
vs.) Civil Action No. 12-cv-10780
vs.)
MERSCORP, INC., MORTGAGE)
ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS,)
INC., BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., BAC)
HOME LOANS SERVICING LP,)
CITIBANK, N.A., CITIMORTGAGE, INC.,)
GMAC MORTGAGE, LLC, JPMORGAN)
CHASE BANK, N.A., STATE STREET)
CORP., WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. and)
DOE CORPORATIONS I-MMM,)
vs.)
Defendants.)

AGREED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME

Pursuant to Rule 6(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Norfolk County files this unopposed motion to respectfully request that the Court extend the briefing schedule for Plaintiff's motion to remand by one week for all deadlines. Plaintiff submits that good cause exists for the requested relief, and in support states as follows:

1. This action was filed on March 30, 2012 in Suffolk County Superior Court against defendants MERSCORP, Inc., Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., Bank of America, N.A., BAC Home Loans Servicing LP, CitiBank, N.A., CitiMortgage, INC., GMAC Mortgage, LLC, JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., State Street Corp., and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
2. On May 1, 2012, Defendant GMAC Mortgage, LLC ("GMAC") filed a Notice of Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441 and 1446, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 81(c), and Local Rule 81.1. All other named defendants consented to removal.

3. After notifying Defendants that Plaintiff intends to file a motion to remand this action back to state court, Plaintiff and Defendants agreed to a schedule to allow time for Plaintiff's motion to remand to be fully briefed and considered before Defendants are required to respond to the complaint.

4. On May 11, 2012, Defendant GMAC filed an Agreed Motion to Extend Time requesting the following briefing schedule: Motion to Remand, due June 7; Response to Motion to Remand, due July 9; Reply in Support of Motion to Remand, due July 23; Response to Complaint, due 30 days after ruling on motion to remand.

5. On May 14, 2012, the Court granted the Agreed Motion to Extend Time and entered the above schedule.

6. On June 6, 2012, counsel for Plaintiff contacted counsel for Defendant GMAC to request a one-week extension for filing its Motion to Remand, with a corresponding extension for all related briefing. Defendant GMAC responded that none of the Defendants objected to Plaintiff's request.

7. Plaintiff seeks the requested relief for good cause and does not intend to delay these proceedings. Plaintiff requires additional time to complete its investigation and research of the statements of fact and arguments underlying the Notice of Removal, and to formulate its arguments in support of remand. The requested relief will not affect any other deadlines in the Case Management Order. No party will be adversely impacted if this motion is granted.

8. Accordingly, Plaintiff hereby requests that the following agreed schedule be entered:

- Motion for Remand, due June 14, 2012;
- Opposition to Motion for Remand, due July 16, 2012;

- Reply brief in support of Motion to Remand, due July 30, 2012;
- Defendants' response to the complaint, due 30 days after the Court's ruling on motion to remand.

Dated: June 6, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christian Siebott

Stanley D. Bernstein (Bernstein@bernlieb.com)
Christian Siebott (Siebott@bernlieb.com)
Jeffrey Lerner (Lerner@bernlieb.com)
BERNSTEIN LIEBHARD LLP
10 East 40th Street
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 779-1414
Facsimile: (212) 779- 3218

Robert T. Naumes (rnaumes@tenlaw.com)
THORNTON & NAUMES, LLP
100 Summer Street, 30th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
Telephone: (888) 491-9726
Facsimile: (617) 720-2445

Counsel for Plaintiff Norfolk County

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above document was served upon the attorney of record for each other party through transmission of the Notice of Electronic Filing, pursuant to Local Rule 5.4, this 6th day of June 2012.

/s/ Jeffrey Lerner